REMARKS

Claims 1-39 are all the claims pending in the application, of which claims 15-39 are

withdrawn. By this Amendment, Applicant amends claims 1-14.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly being directed to non-

statutory subject matter. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Applicant amends claims 1, 3, 9, 10, 13, and 14 to recite, *inter alia*, "means for...," and

respectfully submits that claims 1-14 satisfy 35 U.S.C. § 101. Applicant respectfully notes that

the amendments are at least supported by the embodiments illustrated in FIGS. 1-9 and the

accompanying discussion from page 19, line 8 to page 42, line 22.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-5, 7-11, 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being

anticipated by Lonnfors et al. (U.S. Patent 6,757,722, hereinafter "Lonnfors"). Applicant

respectfully traverses the rejection.

Applicant has invented, *inter alia*, a presence system for automatically changing the

status of a presentity based on a change in status of <u>other</u> presentities.

Conventionally, a presence system is used to manage communication between different

users over a network. In the conventional system, a server executes a presence service that

manages connections between clients and the presence service. A user operating a client

provides presence information to the server regarding the user's status. The user's status, *i.e.*, the

state of the user, is managed by the server as a "presentity." Other users operating clients

connected to the server may execute a "watcher" application that requests the presence service to

provide the current presence information, or status, of a presentity representing another user.

Buddy lists are used to track the various states of users on the presence system. For

example, a user may be "online," "offline," etc. Thus, a user may execute a watcher application

on a client to request the status of presentities on the presence system. However, in the

conventional systems, each user must manually set their own presence status, and thus, users

inevitably forget to update their own presence status when their status changes. Accordingly, a

user who is actually "offline" may be improperly indicated as "online," and vice versa.

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, "at least one presence calculating means for determining the

presence information for said presentity provided by said present service client means <u>based on a</u>

<u>change in the presence information for the presentities</u> **other** <u>than said presentity</u> received by

said presence service client means."

However, Lonnfors neither teaches nor suggests the "presence calculating means." This

is because Lonnfors does not disclose changing presence information of a presentity when

presence information of <u>other</u> presentities changes. Instead, Lonnfors discloses a presence server

that provides presence information regarding a presentity's state. *See* Lonnfors, col. 4, ll. 39-40,

53-67, col. 8, ll. 8-10. The presence information is received by subscribing user equipment (UE)

executing "watcher" applications in the form of a notification that the status of the presentity has

changed. *See* Lonnfors, col. 7, ll. 61-67, col. 8, ll. 10-22. That is to say, when the watcher

application on the UE is informed that the status of a monitored presentity has changed by the

server, the monitored presentity's status is changed at the UE. *See* Lonnfors, Abstract, col. 6, ll.

44-53, 65-67, col. 7, ll. 61-64.

  Therefore, at best, Lonnfors is nothing more than an example of the prior art failures in

which users operating UEs, *i.e.*, clients, are informed of presentity status changes. However,

there is no teaching or suggestion that a status of a presentity is changed "based on a change in

the presence information for the presentities **other** than said presentity." In other words,

Lonnfors does not disclose that status of a presentity of a user, who is operating a UE and has

their own presentity, changes based on a change in other presentities' statuses. Indeed, there is

no disclosure whatsoever of how presentity status is changed in Lonnfors, and much less that

presentity status is changed "based on a change in the presence information for the presentities

other than said presentity," as required by claim 1.

  As a result, Lonnfors fails to teach or suggest all the features of claim 1, and hence, claim

1 and its dependent claims would not have been anticipated by Lonnfors for at least these

reasons.

  Independent claims 3, 9, 10, 13, and 14 recite features similar to those discussed above

regarding claim 1, and hence, claims 3, 9, 10, 13, 14, and their dependent claims also would not

have been anticipated by Lonnfors for at least reasons analogous to those discussed above

regarding claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 6 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Lonnfors in view of Salomaki et al. (WO 02/093959, hereinafter "Salomaki"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claims 6 and 12 depend on claims 3 and 10, respectively, and incorporate all the features of claims 3 and 10. Salomaki is merely cited for teaching managing a presence database. Even if Lonnfors and Salomaki could have somehow been combined, as the Examiner asserts, the combination would still not contain all the features in claims 3 and 10, and hence claims 6 and 12, as discussed above. Accordingly, claims 6 and 12 would not have been rendered unpatentable by the combination of Lonnfors and Salomaki for at least these reasons.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111   Attorney Docket No.: Q79465
U.S. Appln. No.: 10/761,364

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue

Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any

overpayments to said Deposit Account.

                                                    Respectfully submitted,

                                                    / Christopher J. Bezak /

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC   _____
Telephone: (202) 293-7060   Christopher J. Bezak
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860   Registration No. 63,241

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: May 18, 2009